

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application and stand rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Skinner (US 5,441,158).

Claim 1 recites, a “Mobile device for collecting and validating collected articles, each article equipped with a transponder and comprising means for moving along a runway in a predetermined path and means for receiving articles collected during this displacement one by one,

wherein the mobile device further comprises radio-frequency (RF) interrogation means for obtaining identifying information on each of the articles collected by the device and comparison means for comparing the identifying information obtained with references relative to a determined order for articles and thus for validating the collected articles as the articles are collected along the runway.”

In the rejection, the Examiner contends that Skinner’s reader 178 corresponds to the recited mobile device. However, Applicant submit Skinner’s reader 178 does not correspond to the recited “mobile device” for the following reasons. In particular, as recited in claim 1 the mobile device moves along a runway and has means for collecting articles in a predetermined path. More specifically, the mobile device comprises RF interrogation means in order to cooperate with transponders of articles. As a result, during the displacement of the mobile device along the rail the mobile device collects articles, the validation of the collected articles being made as they are collected along the rail, i.e. at the time of this collection.

On the contrary, in Skinner, the reader 178, which allegedly corresponds to the recited RF interrogation means, does not move along the rail, but rather, only moves between two positions disposed at a special location, preferably at the end of the course of the rail near the station of the operator, as can be seen on figure 1. Additionally, the reader 178 does not have any means for collecting articles. Finally, Applicants note that an aspect of the invention is exactly to avoid such a method of operating (see the specification paragraph [00004]).

Thus, Applicants submit Skinner fails to disclose a mobile device having both a means for receiving articles and a radio-frequency interrogation means for obtaining identifying information on each of the articles as recited in claim 1. Consequently, Applicants submit claim 1 is allowable for at least this reason. Additionally, Applicants submit claims 2-11 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependencies.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/David P. Emery/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

David P. Emery
Registration No. 55,154

Date: December 18, 2008